



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,162	12/06/2001	Charles E. Nichols	01-758	2861
7590 08/16/2004			EXAMINER	
LSI Logic Corporation Corporate Legal Department Intellectual Property Services Group 1551 McCarthy Boulevard, M/S D-106			CHACE, CHRISTIAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2187	
Milpitas, CA	95035		DATE MAILED: 08/16/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/006,162	NICHOLS ET AL.				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Christian P. Chace	2187				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 20 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension						
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejec	tion(s): 35 USC 112, Second Pa	<u>ragraph</u> .				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) <u>19-27</u> would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.						
The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
7.⊠ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed: 19-27.						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-17</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 18 (canceled in the instant amendment).						
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. Other:						
BEST AVAILABLE COPY						

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' arguments with repsect to claims 1-17 are not persuasive. Applicants' arguments hinge on the interpretation that Chong, Jr. does not teach separate controllers that contain the elements shown in figure 5, and, accordingly, do not anticipate at least the independent claims. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner has interpreted the "first storage controller" to be control module #241, switch #221, cache #341, and parity calculator #321. Likewise, the "second storage controller" contains the same respective elements on the right side of figure 5 of Chong, Jr. To further highlight examiner's position, applicants' figure 1 discloses all of the elements of Chong, Jr., but has a box drawn around them, calling them each "storage controllers." Anything that controls storage is a storage controller. The recited elements in Chong, Jr. control storage as claimed by applicants, and are, therefore, storage controllers.

DONALD SPARKS

SUPERVISORY A GOLT EXAMINER

BEST AVAILABLE COPY